

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

Laura K. Granier (Nevada Bar No. 7357)
Erica K. Nannini (Nevada Bar No. 13922)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 Kietzke Lane, Suite 200
Reno, NV 89511-2094
Phone: 775.327.3000
lkgranier@hollandhart.com
eknannini@hollandhart.com

Hadassah M. Reimer, Esq (Wyo. Bar No. 6-3825)
Admitted Pro Hac Vice
HOLLAND & HART LLP
P.O. Box 68
Jackson, WY 83001
Tel: 307-734-4517
hmreimer@hollandhart.com

*Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenor
Lithium Nevada Corp.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

15	BARTELL RANCH, LLC, et al.,)	<i>Lead Case:</i>
16	Plaintiffs,)	Case No. 3:21-cv-00080-MMD-CLB
17	v.)	LITHIUM NEVADA CORP.'S
18	ESTER M. McCULLOUGH, et al.,)	OPPOSITION TO RENO-SPARKS
19	Defendants,)	INDIAN COLONY, ATSA KOODAKUH
20	and)	WYH NUWU/PEOPLE OF RED
21	LITHIUM NEVADA CORP.,)	MOUNTAIN'S & BURNS PAUTE
22	Defendant-Intervenor.)	TRIBE MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
)	INJUNCTION
)	EVIDENTIARY HEARING
)	REQUESTED

Lithium Nevada Corp. ("Lithium Nevada") submits these points and authorities in opposition to the Motion for Preliminary Injunction (ECF 45 & 62) and requests an evidentiary hearing. *Charlton v. Est. of Charlton*, 841 F.2d 988, 989 (9th Cir. 1988) (unless a party waives its right, an evidentiary hearing should be held where essential facts are in dispute).

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

INTRODUCTION

Extensive prior surface disturbance including trenching, bulk sampling and mineral exploration drilling under numerous prior BLM authorizations¹ has occurred in the Thacker Pass project area over the past eleven years. Yet, it was not until just three weeks ago the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony (“RS Colony”) and Atsa koodakuh wyh Nuwu/People of Red Mountain (“the People”), later joined by the Burns Paiute Tribe (collectively the “Intervenors”), sought to assert their claim that cultural resource mitigation on less than 0.3 acre in this same area will cause irreparable harm. Within this same project area, multiple prior BLM authorizations for mining, including two open pits for clay mining have issued after tribal consultation in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (“NHPA”). During these authorization processes, tribal consultation, and years of disturbance in the Thacker Pass project area, Intervenors had never objected to much greater disturbance on acreage many times larger than the 0.3 acre at issue here.

BLM and Lithium Nevada take very seriously the agency’s tribal consultation obligations and, as discussed below, extensive notices, communications and collaboration have been ongoing. BLM and Lithium Nevada have, for years, worked with the interested tribes on identifying and addressing any issues. None of those tribes have expressed concerns about their consultation process. Moreover, as the Intervenors’ own filings with this Court reflect, the BLM, although not required, in its discretion, has offered them consultation for the pending “ARPA” permit which is a separate process from consultation for the overall project but is an opportunity for them to have

¹ FEIS Table 2.1, Previously Authorized and Existing Surface Disturbance (citing, for example, BLM Casefile No. N85255, authorized Jan. 25, 2010, for 75 acres of surface disturbance for the Kings Valley Lithium Exploration Project & BLM Casefile No. N91547, authorized May 15, 2014 for 114 acres of disturbance for the Kings Valley Clay Mine).

1 BLM consider their concerns of alleged imminent harm for the cultural resource mitigation at issue
2 in the Motion. Therefore, as discussed below, the Motion is premature.

3 Because BLM has offered Intervenor consultation prior to issuance of the permit under
4 the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (“ARPA”), 43 C.F.R. Part 7, and the cultural
5 resource mitigation cannot commence without that permit, this claim is not ripe. BLM invited
6 Intervenor to contact BLM to participate in consultation on issuance of the ARPA permit. (ECF
7 43-6). If Intervenor reject this offer or have not responded, their asserted harm from lack of
8 consultation is of their own making and, such inequitable conduct should preclude injunctive relief.

9 Intervenor cannot establish a likelihood of success on the merits because (a) through not
10 only the multi-year review process for this project but also numerous authorizations since 2009,
11 Intervenor never provided BLM notice that the Project area is of cultural or religious significance
12 to them, until June 2021; and (b) the People are not a tribe under the NHPA. Intervenor also
13 cannot establish that without injunctive relief they will suffer irreparable harm because BLM has
14 invited them to consult on the ARPA permit where they can provide all of the information they
15 wish and propose efforts they want to see in how the cultural resource mitigation is performed.
16 They have the opportunity through that consultation to share all relevant information about the
17 locations of concern to them, the details of those concerns and any proposals they have for
18 mitigation – before the cultural resource mitigation can commence. That their concerns may be
19 ameliorated through the offered consultation that is pending renders their Motion premature.

20 The Thacker Pass Project (“Project”) will be an open-pit lithium mine on Lithium Nevada’s
21 unpatented mining claims approximately 17 miles from Orovada. Record of Decision (“ROD”) at
22 1 (Pl. Ex. 1). The Project’s review was extensive, thorough and required many years of work,
23 including collection of significant baseline data. Lithium Nevada’s commitment to mitigation is
24
25
26
27
28

substantial, including millions of dollars to relocate the Project to avoid the Montana Mountains, one of the places Intervenor identify of concern in their Motion.

The Project is important to leveraging domestic lithium reserves to secure our nation's critical supply chain. The Department of Interior has identified Lithium as a critical mineral. President Biden's Executive Order 14017 (**Ex. 1**), identifies the need for the U.S. to leverage sizeable lithium reserves to expand electric vehicle battery production to help "tackle the climate crisis."² President Biden also seeks to ensure that the U.S. is not dependent on foreign sources for critical minerals as a matter of national security.³ Because the activity the Intervenor seek to enjoin is cultural resource mitigation work on less than 0.3 acre of land in the Project area where significant surface disturbance has occurred for years without objection and Intervenor still can consult on that work before it commences, *any* alleged harm is speculative, no legal basis exists to enjoin the mitigation and to do so would be contrary to the public interest in development of a project with strategic importance to national security.

BACKGROUND

Because the Court is familiar with the BLM's approval of the Project, Lithium Nevada provides the following brief discussion of background relevant to the Motion and incorporates by reference the detailed background information provided in ECF 31.

A. History of Surface Disturbance in Thacker Pass Project Area

Lithium Nevada has been working in the Thacker Pass area on public lands that are open to mineral entry, for more than a decade. **Ex. 2**, Catherine Clark Dec. ¶ 3. Over the course of that

² See also White House Statements and Releases, *FACT SHEET: Securing America's Critical Supply Chains*, (Feb. 24, 2021) (explaining President Biden's EO to help create more resilient and secure supply chains for critical and essential goods) (Ex. 1).

³ See also Ex. 1 ("Critical minerals are an essential part of defense, high-tech, and other products. . . the United States needs to ensure we are not dependent upon foreign sources or single points of failure in times of national emergency.").

1 time, employees, contractors and the BLM have walked the project area extensively for
2 environmental baseline, other studies and in the course of conducting trenching, exploration
3 drilling and other previously authorized disturbance. *Id.* ¶¶ 5, 14; **Ex. 3**, Randal Burns Dec. ¶3-6.
4 In over a decade of work in the area including trenching, road building, and digging test pits (all
5 authorized by BLM after tribal consultation) Intervenorors never came forward or provided BLM
6 any notice of the information they now put before this Court, until June 2021. *Id.*, ¶¶ 6-14. In the
7 years of work in the Project area, no employees or contractors have observed any religious events
8 or encountered any human remains, funerary items, sacred objects or objects of cultural patrimony.
9 Had any such items of cultural importance been encountered, work would have come to an
10 immediate halt with notice to BLM. *Id.* ¶14; **Ex. 3** ¶6-9, **Ex. 3A**. Over the past eleven years of
11 work at Thacker Pass, Lithium Nevada has reached out numerous times and coordinated with BLM
12 to reach communities and stakeholders including Tribes. **Ex. 4**, Maria Anderson Dec. ¶¶2-21, 35;
13 **Ex. 2** ¶7. No traditional cultural property (“TCP”) issue or concern has ever been identified in the
14 Thacker Pass Project area before the Intervenorors’ June 2021 letter to the BLM. **Ex.2** ¶ 14; *Id.*; **Ex.4**
15 ¶13-16, 18, 20-21.

16 In 2009, BLM approved the Kings Valley Lithium (“KVL”) Exploration Project across
17 approximately 3,549 acres and digging up to 75 acres in the project area – the same area
18 Intervenorors assert should not be disturbed. **Ex. 2** ¶ 10-12, Exhibit 2A (map showing Thacker Pass
19 project area overlap with prior disturbance). The KVL Exploration Plan approved drilling, road
20 building, trenching, and other disturbance. To date, approximately 50 acres of disturbance have
21 occurred. *Id.* ¶ 12; **Ex.2C-D**. In 2014, BLM approved the Kings Valley Clay Mine located in the
22 project area, and clay mining from two open pits with stockpiling on-site. The open pits, waste
23 rock disposal areas, roads and ancillary facilities were authorized over 114 acres of disturbance
24 within a 796-acre project boundary with a project life of approximately 20 years. *Id.*¶ 13.

1 Despite a full public process for prior BLM authorizations and obvious significant
2 disturbance in the Project area for years, Intervenor never objected to many acres of trenching,
3 digging and drilling in this area. Extensive surface disturbance has occurred in the Project area
4 through hundreds of exploration drill holes, trenching, and clay mining pits (**Ex. 2C-D & Ex. 3**)
5 with no objection from Intervenor and no encounters or discovery of any religious or cultural
6 materials (which would have immediately halted work and been reported to the BLM) through any
7 of the many acres of disturbance. *Id.*; Ex. 3A.

9 **B. NHPA Consultation for the Record of Decision**

10 As required by NHPA, BLM initiated consultation from the “early stages (October 2018)”
11 of the Project and continued that consultation throughout the National Environmental Policy Act
12 (“NEPA”) review. ROD at 5. Before the NEPA scoping process began in early 2020, BLM
13 initiated consultation with the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe (within the Project
14 region), the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe (125 miles from the Project area), and the Winnemucca
15 Indian Colony (70 miles from the Project area).⁴ BLM continued outreach throughout the NEPA
16 process.

18 **C. Extensive Notice, Interaction & Engagement at Fort McDermitt**

19 For years, Lithium Nevada has provided notices and worked on community outreach and
20 engagement with all stakeholders including the Fort McDermitt Tribe. In addition to public notice
21 the BLM provided through the course of prior authorizations and the Thacker Pass project, the
22 project has attracted the attention of the Reno-Sparks local media (**Ex. 2 ¶4**), and Lithium Nevada
23 has made substantial efforts to notify all possible interested stakeholders and community members
24

25
26
27 ⁴ Lithium Nevada respectfully requests the Court to take judicial notice of the approximate
28 distances of each of the consulted tribes from the Project area developed from online mapping
resources. *United States v. Perea-Rey*, 680 F.3d 1179, 1182 n.1 (9th Cir. 2012).

1 about the project and hold meetings and host gatherings to provide information and hear any issues
2 from stakeholders including tribal members. **Ex. 4** ¶7; **Ex. 5**, Dec. of Pepi Bengoa; **Ex. 7** ¶12.
3 Many tribal members have responded to that outreach, engaging in collaborative efforts with
4 Lithium Nevada, voicing their opinions, and participating in the BLM's process. **Ex. 4**, **Ex. 7**.
5 These notices, meetings and communications began before the pandemic and continue through
6 today and were provided both on social media (including an active Facebook group called the
7 "McDermitt People Reporting News" which includes many residents of the Fort McDermitt
8 Paiute-Shoshone Reservation among its more than 800 members) and in local frequented locations
9 at Fort McDermitt to maximize the scope of availability of the information. **Ex. 4**, **Ex. 5** ¶ 2-9.
10 Notice has also extended well beyond the McDermitt area; Lithium Nevada has worked with local
11 tribal leaders to publicize employment opportunities to tribal members who work elsewhere and
12 want to return home. **Ex.4**, ¶32.

13
14
15 **D. Activity at Issue in Intervenor's Motion & Remaining ARPA Process**

16 Intervenor's assert the cultural resources mitigation which will disturb no more than 0.25
17 acres with anticipated trenching on only 0.04 acres will cause irreparable harm. (ECF 30-1 ¶11).
18 The work is intended to mitigate impacts on any eligible historic properties through treatment
19 measures including avoidance, data recovery at selected sites, public outreach and interpretation
20 and other approved methods. *Id.* ¶9. This cultural resource mitigation that can occur only at certain
21 times of the year, weather dependent, is part of the critical path for project construction, and must
22 commence soon to ensure that the project development remains on track to deliver lithium to the
23 United States market by 2025. **Ex. 6**, J. Lowry Dec ¶15; **Ex. 7** A. Zawadzki Dec. ¶20-22.

24
25 Notably this mitigation and the 0.29 acre disturbance Intervenor's assert will cause
26 irreparable harm will not occur until BLM issues an APRA permit (a process for which they have
27 offered Intervenor's consultation). ARPA requires this BLM permit before any excavation or
28

1 removal of any archaeological resource on public lands. 16 U.S.C. § 470cc(a); *see also* 43 C.F.R.
2 § 7.5(a). The ARPA regulations provide that upon request, “the Federal land manager may meet
3 with official representatives of any Indian tribe or group to discuss their interests, including ways
4 to avoid or mitigate potential harm or destruction such as excluding sites from the permit area.”
5 *Id.* § 7.7(a)(3). Any adopted mitigation measures must be incorporated into the terms and
6 conditions of the ARPA permit. *Id.*; *see also id.* § 7.9(c).

7
8 Intervenor seek to enjoin the cultural resources mitigation and argue that absent injunctive
9 relief, physical disturbance will occur at “a massacre site, possible burial sites, and historic eligible
10 for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Properties.” (at 3). However, Intervenor do not
11 explain why they never (before June 2021) notified BLM of the importance of this area even
12 through all the prior authorizations for substantial disturbance. Over the past eleven years Lithium
13 Nevada has worked in the Thacker Pass area and received multiple BLM approvals and Intervenor
14 never objected or expressed concern that the area is a Traditional Cultural Property or sacred.

15
16 In addition, Intervenor’s area of importance does not appear to be within the Project area.
17 Intervenor describe caves where their ancestors hid from soldiers, but the Project area is mostly
18 flat. Lithium Nevada surveyed over 18,000 acres and did not identify any caves within the baseline
19 survey area for the Project. **Ex. 2 ¶ 9, Ex. 2B** (aerial photograph of Thacker Pass project area).
20 There also is now showing of irreparable harm because while Intervenor have not identified with
21 any specificity the locations of concern to them, their descriptions appear to be of an area other
22 than Thacker Pass given that the Fort McDermitt tribe’s culture is not to bury the remains of their
23 ancestors but instead to wrap them in a blanket and pile rocks on top of the remains and not bury
24 the remains of their ancestors in the ground. **Ex. 10**, Alice Crutcher Dec. ¶4.
25
26
27
28

ARGUMENT

I. Judicial Review under the APA & Standard for Preliminary Injunction

The Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) provides a limited scope of judicial review of agency actions. 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-06; *Pit River Tribe v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 469 F.3d 768, 778 (9th Cir. 2006). A court may reverse an agency decision only if it is “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). An agency’s decision may be overturned only if the agency relied on factors Congress did not intend it consider, entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation counter to the evidence before it, or is so implausible it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise. *McFarland v. Kempthorne*, 545 F.3d 1106, 1110 (9th Cir. 2008). The standard of review is “highly deferential, presuming the agency action to be valid and affirming the agency action if a reasonable basis exists for its decision.” *Nat’l Mining Ass’n v. Zinke*, 877 F.3d 845, 866 (9th Cir. 2017). A court “may not substitute its judgment for that of the agency.” *Env’tl. Def. Ctr. v. EPA*, 344 F.3d 832, 858 n.36 (9th Cir. 2003).

A preliminary injunction is “an extraordinary and drastic remedy” that requires the movant, “by a clear showing,” to “carr[y] the burden of persuasion.” *Lopez v. Brewer*, 680 F.3d 1068, 1072 (9th Cir. 2012). Preliminary injunctive relief requires demonstration of (1) likelihood of success on the merits, (2) likelihood of irreparable harm absent an injunction, (3) the balance of equities tips in its favor, and (4) the injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). Irreparable injury must be “likely in the absence of an injunction.” *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 22 (rejecting a “possibility” of irreparable harm standard). Intervenor here show only a speculative possibility of harm particularly given the consultation process is ongoing.

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

II. Plaintiffs Are Not Likely to Succeed on the Merits & Lack Standing

Intervenors argue that BLM violated its NHPA obligations and that BLM's identification of the tribes affected by the Project was unreasonable because Intervenors were not identified. However, the Intervenors do not explain why they have never before disclosed their interest in the Thacker Pass area to the BLM, through a request for consultation, to seek an eligibility determination, or even a request for notice of any surface disturbing activities in the Project area. Plaintiffs do not explain why, with more than a decade of substantial disturbance ongoing at Thacker Pass, they have never before raised these concerns when the BLM authorizations for nearly two hundred acres of disturbance in the same area (*see, e.g.*, Ex.2A, 2G) occurred years ago, long before the COVID pandemic. To the extent this Project may have reawakened Intervenors' interest in Thacker Pass that they have never before disclosed, BLM has demonstrated a willingness to consult with the tribes in future actions – including the pending ARPA permit – but the agency was not obligated to anticipate the Intervenors' previously undisclosed interest in the area.

The NHPA is intended to “foster conditions under which our modern society and our historic property can existing in productive harmony,” 54 U.S.C. § 300101(1). “Like NEPA, ‘[s]ection 106 of NHPA is a “stop, look, and listen” provision that requires each federal agency to consider the effects of its programs.’” *Te-Moak Tribe v. U.S.*, 608 F.3d 592, 607 (9th Cir. 2010). NHPA “requires federal agencies to ‘make a reasonable and good faith effort’ to identify historic properties that might be affected by an action, and to ‘take [those potential effects] into account.’” *Wildearth Guardians v. Provencio*, 923 F.3d 655, 676 (9th Cir. 2019).

“Properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe . . . may be determined to be eligible for inclusion on the National Register.” 54 U.S.C. §302706(a). “The BLM refers to such properties as ‘properties of cultural and religious importance’ or ‘PCRIs.’ *Te-*

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

1 *Moak Tribe*, 608 F.3d at 607. “The term ‘TCP’ [traditional cultural property] is analogous to
2 ‘PCRI’; it describes land that Native American tribes have identified as having cultural or religious
3 significance. *Te-Moak*, 608 F.3d at 607-08 n.16. “The goal of consultation is to identify historic
4 properties potentially affected by the undertaking” 36 C.F.R. § 800.1. Upon identification by
5 a tribe during or prior to consultation, BLM may evaluate a TCP to determine whether it is eligible
6 for listing on the National Register and therefore protected by the NHPA.
7

8 The NHPA regulations provide additional detail regarding consultation. BLM must “make
9 a reasonable and good faith effort to identify Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations that
10 shall be consulted in the section 106 process.” 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c)(2)(ii)(A). “Further,
11 ‘[c]onsultation [with Indian tribes] should commence early in the planning process, in order to
12 identify and discuss relevant preservation issues,’ . . . and ‘must recognize the government-to-
13 government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.” *Te-Moak*, 608 F.3d
14 at 607. (quoting § 800.2(c)(2)(ii)(C)).
15

16 As noted by Intervenor (at 14), BLM and the State Historic Preservation Office (“SHPO”)
17 negotiated the State Protocol Agreement (revised Dec. 22, 2014), which governs the procedures
18 by which BLM completes Section 106 consultations in Nevada.⁵ The State Protocol Agreement
19 identifies the type of undertaking that requires consultation with the SHPO, how BLM and the
20 SHPO communicate regarding determinations of whether the undertaking will have an adverse
21 effect on historic properties and the procedures in the case of an adverse effect determination.
22

23 **A. BLM Complied with the State Protocol**

24 Intervenor (at 14) alleges BLM violated a “bright-line” standard by failing to prepare a
25 Memorandum of Agreement (“MOA”) prior to the ROD. (at 14-15). This is inaccurate. The
26

27 ⁵ The State Protocol Agreement is available at
28 https://shpo.nv.gov/uploads/documents/BLM_Nevada_State_Protocol_Agreement_2014.pdf.

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

1 publicly available MOA Between the DOI, BLM Winnemucca District Office and the Nevada
2 SHPO Regarding the Lithium Nevada Thacker Pass Project Humboldt County (“Thacker Pass
3 MOA”) is posted on the SHPO website.⁶ The MOA was signed on October 29, 2020 and November
4 5, 2020, prior to the completion of the FEIS on December 4, 2020, and the ROD in January 2021.

5
6 Intervenor assert that the draft MOA should have been made available for public
7 comment. Again, the text of the Thacker Pass MOA indicates that this took place. The Thacker
8 Pass MOA recites that BLM notified the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe, Summit Lake
9 Paiute Tribe, and the Winnemucca Indian Colony about the Project and offered them “the
10 opportunity to be concurring parties” to the Thacker Pass MOA. **Ex. 9** at 1. It further recites that
11 BLM “coordinated public participation for [the] MOA through the process set forth in the National
12 Environmental Policy Act, and has determined that there are no interested members of the public
13 who might have concerns regarding the effect of the Project on historic properties.” *Id.* at 1-2. The
14 SHPO, which per the State Protocol Agreement “cooperatively implements” Section 106
15 compliance with BLM, signed the Thacker Pass MOA, indicating its endorsement that the public
16 and tribal outreach efforts recited in the document satisfy the Protocol. Thus, contrary to
17 Intervenor’s claims that BLM violated “bright-line” requirements in the Protocol, the BLM
18 satisfied, and the SHPO concurred in, all applicable requirements in the Protocol.

19
20
21 **B. BLM Reasonably Identified Appropriate Tribal Entities for Consultation**

22 BLM completed its Section 106 compliance, including tribal consultation, and the SHPO
23 concurred in BLM’s conclusions. Yet, Intervenor argue that BLM had an obligation to consult
24 with them as well. Intervenor are not likely to succeed on this argument because BLM was not

25
26
27 ⁶ See **Ex. 9**, Thacker Pass MOA, *available at* SHPO
28 [https://shpo.nv.gov/uploads/documents/BLM_-
_WN_Lithium_Nevada_Thacker_Pass_Project_MOA.pdf](https://shpo.nv.gov/uploads/documents/BLM_-_WN_Lithium_Nevada_Thacker_Pass_Project_MOA.pdf).

1 on notice of their interest in the Project area, Intervenor's claim undermines the required respect
2 for the sovereignty of the consulted tribes, Intervenor failed to exhaust their administrative
3 remedies, and the People lack standing to bring this argument.

4
5 **1. BLM Was Not on Notice of the Intervenor's Interest**

6 BLM satisfied its obligation to make "reasonable and good faith" efforts to identify tribes
7 that may attach significance to the Project area under Section 800.3(f)(2). BLM consulted broadly
8 with tribes in the Project area region and beyond. Notably, membership in the tribes with whom
9 BLM consulted and their shared history is the basis for the Intervenor's concerns. Eben Dec., ECF
10 45-1 ¶¶ 6-7, 13 (discussing shared culture and history); Hinkey Dec., ECF 45-2 ¶¶ 1, 8-9; Teeman
11 Dec., ECF 62-1 ¶ 11. While the Intervenor's rely on their shared history and membership with the
12 tribes that were consulted here, nothing in the record suggests any of those consulted tribes ever
13 mentioned the events and oral history identified by the Intervenor's. While Intervenor's only
14 generally identify areas of concern, accounts of a Fort McDermitt Elder and tribal members (**Ex.**
15 **10, 8**), the Thacker Pass actual characteristics that do not match the Intervenor's descriptions
16 (regarding caves and the Montana Mountains), and the lack of discovery in all the years of ongoing
17 work in the Thacker Pass project area (**Ex. 2, 3**), indicate a different location altogether than the
18 Thacker Pass project area (and, therefore, there's no showing of irreparable harm as discussed
19 above). Thus, BLM was not reasonably on notice that more distant tribes, relying on their shared
20 history with the tribes closer to the Project, might have such concerns and even the information
21 recently provided leaves questions as to whether the Intervenor's concerns are in the Thacker Pass
22 Project area. In addition, BLM further consulted with the SHPO, which did not identify a need to
23 consult with Intervenor's.

24 BLM conducted outreach to tribes both local to the project area and those more distant.
25 The list of tribes BLM consulted demonstrates that BLM appropriately sought to identify tribes
26
27
28

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

1 with an interest in the Project area, not simply those local to the Project. The fact that none of the
2 tribes consulted, who share the cultural history upon which Intervenor rely, identified the
3 Intervenor's concerns, supports BLM's reasonableness in identifying tribes for consultation.

4 Intervenor's argument that BLM may not rely on consultation with one tribe or "group" of
5 tribes misses the mark here. It is correct that BLM may not "group" tribes when it is on notice or
6 has reason to believe that other tribes may have an interest in the project area. However, the cases
7 Intervenor cite are inapposite. In *Standing Rock Sioux Tribe v. U.S.*, 205 F. Supp. 3d 4 (D.D.C.
8 2016) and *Quechan Tribe v. U.S.*, 755 F. Supp. 2d 1104, 1112, 1118 (S.D. Cal. 2010), it was not
9 disputed that the agency knew of the plaintiff tribe's interest in the project area. The question was
10 whether the agency's consultation with that tribe was sufficient. The question before this Court is
11 whether BLM had reason to know that the Intervenor had any interest in the Project area. Where
12 Intervenor do not identify any notice they ever provided BLM of their asserted interests, and none
13 of the consultations completed for work over the preceding decade nor its consultations with more
14 local tribes gave BLM any indication the Project area was of significance to Intervenor, the
15 agency lacked the notice that was present in *Standing Rock Sioux Tribe* and *Quechan Tribe*.

16
17
18 **2. *Intervenor's Claim Undermines the Required Respect for the***
19 ***Sovereignty of the Consulted Tribes***

20 If Intervenor disagree with the positions taken by the designated tribal representatives in
21 the consulted tribes (MPI at 12), such disagreements are not appropriately resolved through a
22 challenge to BLM's Section 106 compliance. The NHPA regulations mandate that BLM's
23 consultation be "respectful of tribal sovereignty" and "recognize the government-to-government
24 relationship between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes." 36 C.F.R. 800.2(c)(ii)(B), (C).
25 Courts have long held that allowing third parties, or individual members of a tribe to assert claims
26 on behalf of the tribe would "in effect, be allowing [the third party or tribal member] to disregard
27 the Tribe's right to be the final arbiter and, thereby, the final spokesman for intra-tribal affairs
28

1 through a procedure characterized by one court as a ‘back door method of . . . attempting to
 2 represent a tribe without approval or authority.” *San Juan Citizens Alliance v. Norton*, 586 F. Supp.
 3 2d 1270, 1293 (D. N.M. 2008) (quoting *National Indian Youth Council v. Andrus*, 501 F. Supp.
 4 649, 684 (D. N.M. 1980)). “Doing so would violate the regulatory requirement to recognize the
 5 tribe as a sovereign authority.” 586 F. Supp. 2d at 1293. Thus, the Intervenor’s claims arising from
 6 or on behalf of Fort McDermitt tribe members are improper as a matter of law.
 7

8 **3. Intervenor’s Failed to Exhaust Their Administrative Remedies**

9 Intervenor’s claim is also unlikely to succeed on the merits because they failed to exhaust
 10 their administrative remedies. “As a general rule, [courts] will not consider issues not presented
 11 before an administrative proceeding at the appropriate time.” *Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n*
 12 *v. Bureau of Land Management*, 606 F.3d 1058, 1065 (9th Cir. 2009). The Project is a well-
 13 publicized effort that has been ongoing for years – including activity that significantly predates the
 14 current pandemic. *See* Background, Section A. Indeed, one member of The People has been on
 15 Lithium Nevada’s project mailing list since February 2019. **Ex. 4**, Anderson Dec. ¶¶ 6-7. Further,
 16 the declarant for RS Colony asserts that she is the tribe’s longtime Tribal Historic Preservation
 17 Officer (“THPO”),⁷ with extensive experience in consultations and describes the RS Colony as
 18 “an active leader in protecting Native American culture.” This well qualified individual admittedly
 19 experienced with Section 106 made no effort to identify any part of the Project area as a TCP
 20 during the decade of prior disturbance that has occurred in the area and did not submit comments
 21 or otherwise participate in any of those prior authorizations or the Project review but contacted
 22 BLM for the very first time about the Project area only months after the ROD was signed. (ECF
 23 45-1, ¶¶ 3-5). In addition to the public outreach under the NEPA process, BLM also consulted with
 24
 25
 26

27 ⁷ A THPO is a tribal officer appointed by the tribe’s “chief governing authority” who assumes the
 28 role of the SHPO on tribal lands. 36 C.F.R. § 800.16(w).

1 tribes throughout northern Nevada and the SHPO. None of these efforts resulted in any evidence
 2 or documentary record of the Intervenor's interest in the Project area. *See supra*.

3 Where, as here, there is no record evidence of information to have put BLM on notice of
 4 the Intervenor's interest in the Project to allow BLM to understand and act on or respond to the
 5 issue, exhaustion applies to such claims from an out-of-region tribe. The Intervenor's silence for
 6 years of disturbance and prior BLM authorizations in the Project area notwithstanding numerous
 7 solicitations for public participation should result in their claims being barred for failure to exhaust
 8 administrative remedies. *See Battle Mountain Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone*
 9 *Indians v. U.S. Dep't of the Interior*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115093, *36 (D. Nev. Order dated
 10 August 26, 2016) (the public interest is "disserved" by allowing parties to object to a lengthy
 11 NHPA process well after the ROD has issued).

12 **4. The People Lack Standing to Bring the Consultation Claim.**

13 Finally, the People are not within the statutory definition of "Indian Tribe" with whom the
 14 NHPA requires consultation, failed to timely request discretionary consulting party status and,
 15 therefore, lack standing to challenge the BLM's consultation process. The NHPA defines "Indian
 16 Tribe" or "tribe" as "an Indian Tribe, band, nation or other organized group or community . . .
 17 which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services by the United States to Indians
 18 because of their status as Indians". 54 U.S.C. § 300309; 36 C.F.R. § 800.16(m) (same).⁸ An
 19
 20
 21
 22

23
 24 ⁸ Section 106 and its accompanying regulations, 36 C.F.R. Part 800, require government-to-
 25 government consultation with Indian tribes. 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c)(2) (designating Indian tribes as
 26 a consulting party); *see* National Programmatic Agreement, Section 4.f. (consistent with 36 C.F.R.
 27 § 800.2(c)(2), "BLM will consult with the tribal government's official designee"). However,
 28 entitlement to government-to-government consultation is limited to federally recognized Indian
 tribes. *Id.* § 800.16(m) (defining "Indian tribe" as "an Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized
 group or community, . . . recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by
 the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians."); *Snoqualmie Indian Tribe v. FERC*,
 545 F.3d 1207, 1216 (9th Cir. 2008) ("[w]hen the record was closed, the Tribe was not federally

organization must qualify under this definition to enforce the NHPA's tribal consultation requirements. *Slockish v. United States Fed'l Hwy. Admin.*, 682 F. Supp. 2d 1178, 1202-03 (D. Or. 2009). The People is an unincorporated group and make no claim to have been formally recognized as an Indian tribe by the Secretary of the Interior. (ECF 46 ¶ 2,10). As such, it was not entitled to participate in government-to-government consultation under 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c)(2); *Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*, 545 F.3d at 1216. Rather, consistent with BLM's obligations under Section 800.2(c)(2) and the National Programmatic Agreement, BLM engaged in consultation with the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe official designees. *See*, e.g., **Ex. 4** ¶¶18-21. The Programmatic Agreement does not change this requirement. Programmatic Agreement at 2 ("BLM . . . shall consider all written requests of individuals and organizations to participate as consulting parties (36 CFR 800.3(f)).").

Consultation with the People as "individuals [or an] organization[] with a demonstrated interest in the undertaking" based on "the nature of their legal or economic relation to the undertaking or affected properties, or their concern with the undertaking's effects on historic properties[.]" 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c)(5) is not mandatory. Rather, to qualify for this consultation the People were required to make their request in writing.⁹ If an interested individual or organization

recognized. Therefore, NHPA § 106 did not require [the agency] to consult with the Tribe on a government-to-government basis.").

⁹ Courts within the Ninth Circuit considering an agency's obligation to consult with "individuals and organizations" under section 800.2(c)(5) uniformly view such consultation as permissive. *See*, e.g., *Winnemen Wintu Tribe v. United States Forest Serv.*, No. 2:09-cv-01072-KJM-KJN, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42690, at *7 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2017) ("[A] non-federally recognized Indian tribe, is not automatically entitled to consulting party status. Instead, the Tribe 'may' be eligible to participate as a consulting party because it has a 'demonstrated interest,' 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c)(5), but first it must request consulting party status, in writing, from the agency[.]"); *La Cuna De Aztlán Sacred Sites Prot. Circle Advisory Comm. v. U.S.*, No. CV 11-00400 DMG (DTBx), 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123331, at *26 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 16, 2013) ("Other 'individuals and organizations with a demonstrated interest in the undertaking may participate as consulting parties,' by written request, but their participation is subject to the discretion of the agency." (emphasis in original)); *Slockish v. U.S.*, No. 3:08-cv-1169-ST, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118718, at *19 (D. Or. June 19,

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

1 fails to make a request to participate as a discretionary consulting party, that individual or
2 organization “is therefore entitled only to general notice and comment, and to have its views
3 considered, as a member of the public.” *Winnemen Wintu Tribe*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42690,
4 at *7; 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(d). The People make no showing that it followed the process to request
5 discretionary consulting party status under 36 C.F.R. §§ 800.2(c)(5) or 800.3(f)(3) at the
6 appropriate time (i.e. in 2020 when BLM was engaged in the publicized consultation process or
7 any time prior to June 2021). ECF 46 ¶¶ 47-49, 54-60; ECF 45 at 9-18. Therefore, its members
8 could only participate as members of the public. And, in any event, its members were already
9 represented in the consultation process through the official designees of their respective federally-
10 recognized Indian tribes—the official designees of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe.
11 These requirements for consultation are necessary to avoid individual tribal members undermining
12 the government-to-government consultation process already concluded with the tribes.
13

14
15 Moreover, and critical to the People’s complaint and request for injunction, “[a]n
16 organization that fails to make a request for discretionary consulting party status cannot later
17 challenge the Section 106 . . . process for excluding them.” *Okinawa Dugong*, 330 F. Supp. 3d at
18 1184. As one court has aptly explained, while the plaintiffs may define themselves as having a
19 demonstrated interest in the undertaking, if they fail to follow the process to obtain discretionary
20 consulting party status, under “the unambiguous wording of 36 CFR § 800.3(f)(3), plaintiffs have
21 no standing as ‘additional consulting parties’ and cannot state a claim under the NHPA for failing
22

23
24
25 2012) (explaining that plaintiffs “‘are not automatically entitled to be consulting parties,’ but under
26 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(5), due to their economic interest, ‘they may be added as consulting parties but
27 they must first make a request in writing.’” (quoting *Mid States Coal. for Progress v. Surface*
28 *Transp. Bd.*, 345 F3d 520, 553 (8th Cir 2003))). See 36 C.F.R. § 800.3(f)(3).”); *Friends of*
Hamilton Grange v. Salazar, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21855, at *31 n.7 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 12, 2009)
 (“To become a consultant, the party must request participation in writing and be granted consulting
 party status by the agency overseeing the undertaking. 36 C.F.R. § 800.3(f)(3).”).

1 to consult with them on that basis.” *Slockish*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118718, at *20. Therefore,
2 the People lacks standing to challenge BLM’s consultation process. *Okinawa Dugong*, 330 F.
3 Supp. 3d at 1184; *Slockish*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118718, at *20.

4
5 **C. BLM’s Consultation Satisfied Its Obligations Under Section 106.**

6 Intervenor lack standing to complain about the consultation between BLM and the tribes
7 with whom BLM consulted. Any claims the Intervenor assert on behalf of any other tribes
8 regarding the sufficiency of consultation with those other tribes must be dismissed. For example,
9 Intervenor argue that BLM should have been more sensitive to the fact that the Fort McDermitt
10 Paiute and Shoshone Tribe offices were closed during the pandemic (at 13), but a 7th-Generation
11 Member of that Tribe was so upset with Intervenor’s suggestion that she, or the elected
12 representatives of her Tribe, had failed to adequately protect their religious and cultural heritage
13 and traditions that she provided a declaration rebutting their claims. **Ex. 8**, Crutcher Dec. ¶ 11-12.

14
15 Similarly, Intervenor imply that the reason BLM had identified no information about their
16 interest is that the tribes with whom BLM consulted for this Project (and others in the area over
17 the last decade) may have been “reluctant to divulge specific information regarding the location,
18 nature, and activities associated” with the area. (at 13). As Intervenor demonstrate by quoting 36
19 C.F.R. § 800.4(a)(4), federal agencies must respect the confidentiality of sensitive sites.
20 Intervenor present no evidence that BLM failed to do so here or that any tribe withheld any
21 information due to such concerns. While the Crutcher Declaration (**Ex. 8**) rebuts such insinuations,
22 Ms. Crutcher should not have to submit a declaration in litigation to verify her tribe’s position.
23 The respect due to each tribe requires BLM and the courts to take their positions at face value.
24 Intervenor have no basis on which to speculate or standing to proffer positions for other tribes.
25
26
27
28

BLM made a reasonable and good faith effort to identify tribes with interests in the Project area. That Intervenor's were not identified in this process because they had never provided any notice of their asserted interest in the Project area, is not a legal basis to enjoin the cultural work.

III. Intervenor's Fail to Demonstrate Irreparable Harm Absent Injunctive Relief

Intervenor's must demonstrate that they are likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of an injunction to be entitled to relief. *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 22; *Sampson v. Murray*, 415 U.S. 61, 88 (1974). There is no "thumb on the scales" in favor of injunctive relief in NEPA matters, and no support for a claim that the NHPA should be treated any differently.¹⁰ *Monsanto Co. v. Geertson Seed Farms*, 561 U.S. 139, 157-58 (2010). The Ninth Circuit has rejected arguments that "any potential environmental injury automatically merits an injunction." *Earth Island Inst. v. Carlton*, 626 F.3d 462, 474 (9th Cir. 2010). To qualify as irreparable harm, the injury must be "both certain and great." *San Diego Bev. & Kup v. United States*, 997 F. Supp. 1343, 1347 (S.D. Cal. 1998). Even where irreparable harm is demonstrated, an injunction must be narrowly tailored to avoid only the specific harms shown. *Price v. City of Stockton*, 390 F.3d 1105, 1117 (9th Cir. 2004).

Intervenor's allege immediate injury from limited "mechanical trenching" of up to seven sites within the Project area as part of the cultural resource mitigation. The ground disturbance at issue in this Motion is the proposed work on less than half an acre in an area with prior and continuing authorized surface disturbance of nearly 200 acres. **Ex. 7** ¶¶29,32. Intervenor's have not demonstrated harm (as they have not identified specific areas for the BLM to consider) nor is their claim for injunctive relief ripe. No ground-disturbing work will begin before BLM issues an

¹⁰ The cases the Burns Tribe cites to support its argument that Tribal rights are presumed to be irreparable are based on potential injuries to *treaty* rights, not NHPA violations, and Intervenor's have not alleged a treaty violation. See *United States v. Michigan*, 508 F.Supp. 480, 492 (W.D. Mich. 1980)(holding that a state may not constitutionally abrogate or diminish "federal treaty right to fish"); *Nez Perce Tribe v. U.S. Forest Serv.* No. 3:13-cv-348-BLW, 2013 WL 5212317, at *7 (D. Idaho Sept. 2013)(plaintiffs were seeking "to preserve their Treaty rights").

1 ARPA permit. BLM is still reviewing the APRA permit and invited Intervenor to consult in that
2 process. Intervenor has the opportunity to identify concerns with BLM prior to the cultural
3 mitigation. This process may well ameliorate Intervenor's concerns without the need for judicial
4 intervention.

5
6 Intervenor's statements of interest in the area are vague, making it impossible to determine
7 whether the proposed activity will cause "certain and great" impacts to their interests. For example,
8 they assert cultural and religious significance in the Thacker Pass area – which may not be the
9 specific Project area – for four reasons: (1) a massacre of their ancestors occurred in the area
10 (Eben Dec. ¶ 20; Hinkey Dec. ¶¶ 4, 7; Teeman Dec. ¶ 11), (2) some members of the Fort McDermitt
11 Paiute and Shoshone Tribe hid in the Montana Mountains to evade cavalry (Eben Dec ¶ 20; Hinkey
12 Dec ¶¶ 4, 9; Teeman Dec at ¶ 12), (3) ancestors are likely buried in the area (Hinkey Dec ¶ 11;
13 Teeman Dec at ¶ 5), and (4) tribal members have traditionally used and continue to use the area
14 for cultural and religious reasons (Eben Dec ¶ 6; Hinkey Dec ¶¶ 4, 9, 14-15; Teeman Dec ¶ 3-4,
15 10). Based on the information Intervenor provided, it seems certain that at least the second
16 element (the Montana Mountain sites where Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe ancestors
17 sought refuge) will not be affected by the proposed activities because, Lithium Nevada undertook
18 significant expense to relocate the project away from the Montana Mountains. **Ex. 7** ¶¶ 4-8.

19
20
21 With the exception of the Montana Mountains, Intervenor is not clear which parts of the
22 17,933-acre Project Area (FEIS at ES-1) are considered sacred. "Although it is understandable that
23 the [Intervenor] value[] the landscape of the project as a whole, the NHPA requires that BLM
24 protect only against adverse effect on the features of the area that make them eligible for the
25 National Register." *Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone of Nevada v. U.S.*, 608 F.3d 592, 611 (9th
26 Cir. 2010). While they offer that if BLM had solicited consultation with them, they would provide
27 details about each of the four bases upon which they hold the area sacred (Eben Dec ¶¶ 20-22), for
28

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

a preliminary injunction, the burden is on the moving party to make a “clear showing” of imminent irreparable harm. *Lopez*, 680 F.3d at 1072. In addition, there are no caves in the Thacker Pass Project area (Ex.2 ¶9, Ex. 2B) and according to a Fort McDermitt Elder, the tribe would not have buried their ancestors in the ground but would have covered them in rocks above ground. Ex. 10 ¶4. Despite substantial trenching, digging, drilling and road building as well as cultural resource and environmental surveying in the Thacker Pass Project area over the course of more than a decade, no evidence of a massacre or any cultural or religious artifacts or events ever have been encountered. Ex. 2 ¶¶5,8,10-11,14, Ex.2C-D; Ex. 3 ¶4,9. Given the stringent review, training and procedures to halt work and notify BLM if anything is discovered the evidence does not demonstrate any irreparable harm or that the Thacker Pass Project area is the area of concern to Intervenor. Ex. 2, Ex. 3 ¶4,9, Ex.3A.

Intervenor’s asserted harm¹¹ is highly speculative and falls well short of the “clear showing” standard necessary to support an injunction. They speculate that the less than 0.5 acre disturbance for cultural resource mitigation will adversely affect areas of importance to them. However, the declarations they submit do not make clear whether the sites of concern to them are in the (previously disturbed) Project area at all, or potentially impacted by the extremely limited cultural resources mitigation proposed, subject to completion of the ARPA process. Intervenor further speculate that if they participate in the APRA permit review, BLM will not consider and

¹¹ The Burns Tribe argues that an injunction is warranted because procedural harm is presumed irreparable. However, “mere procedural harm is not an appropriate basis” for such relief. *Northwest Envtl. Def. Ctr. v. US Army Corp of Eng’rs*, 817 F.Supp.2d 1290, 1316 (D. Or. 2011). The Supreme Court has made clear that a procedural right “‘in vacuo’ is insufficient to support standing,” and, therefore, it is insufficient to support “entitlement to any court relief.” *Id.* (quoting *Summers v. Earth Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488 (2009)). Because Intervenor have not shown a *likelihood* of irreparable harm to a concrete interest, they are not entitled to injunctive relief.

1 address their concerns appropriately. This speculative harm and their speculative conclusion about
2 the BLM's process, as a matter of law, does not support the extraordinary relief of injunction.

3 **IV. The Balance of Hardships and Public Interest Disfavors the Requested Injunction**

4 Courts "must balance the competing claims of injury and consider the effect on each party
5 of granting or withholding injunctive relief with "particular regard for the public consequences in
6 employing the extraordinary remedy of injunction." *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 24. Here, the balance of
7 hardships and public interest tip sharply against the requested injunction. Battery storage is "vital
8 to combatting climate change and very lithium dependent." Ex. 6, Lowry ¶14. Global lithium
9 demand is forecasted to triple by 2025 and to outstrip supply as electrification of the transportation
10 sector intensifies. The current U.S. demand for lithium is approximately 18,000 tons per year of
11 lithium carbonate equivalent ("tpa LCE"). By 2025, the U.S. is forecasted to require approximately
12 100,000 tpa LCE, increasing to about 350,000 tpa LCE by 2030. This demand increased even
13 more with President Biden's Executive Order on August 5, 2021 aimed at making half of all new
14 vehicles sold in the U.S. electric by 2030. Thacker Pass is the only project positioned to meet that
15 demand. The U.S. currently produces less than 5,000 tpa LCE from just one facility. At a proposed
16 capacity of 66,000 tons per year LCE at full buildout, the Thacker Pass project is positioned to
17 become a cornerstone of the U.S. lithium supply for batteries necessary for renewable energy
18 objectives. There are no other U.S. alternative to Thacker Pass that provide the scale, grade or
19 timeline to production required to keep pace with electrification of the transportation sector and
20 reduction of carbon, in addition to providing the lithium products required by the military for
21 national security. Ex. 7 ¶¶21-26; Ex. 6, Lowry Dec. ¶¶11, 13-14, 15-18. "Thacker Pass is critical
22 to the domestic and global lithium demand necessary to combatting climate change, transportation
23 electrification and expanding renewable energy sources that require battery storage." Ex. 6 ¶14.
24
25
26
27
28

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

Because cultural resource mitigation must be completed prior to pre-construction infrastructure installation and can only be completed during certain times of the year due to weather, delay of this mitigation disturbing less than half an acre would halt development of the largest and most advanced lithium mine in the U.S. with no alternative, eliminating the only currently known domestic source of lithium to meet demands for combatting climate change and important to national security. Ex. 7 ¶25; Ex. 6 Lowry Dec. “The public interest would be disserved by allowing [the Intervenor]s to attack a lengthy, expensive, and complex NHPA process [six months] after the conclusion of the ROD and after an interested party like [Lithium Nevada] has invested millions of dollars in the project under the approved ROD.” *Battle Mountain Band*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115093, *36.

Lithium Nevada has engaged with the Fort McDermitt Tribe and partners to build a local, skilled workforce for the Project. Ex. 4, Anderson Dec. (describing one-on-one meetings, completed training sessions with numerous tribal members, numerous job opportunities and significant tribal interest). Tribal Members are supportive of the Project and feel strongly about its importance to the community, their extensive involvement in the process and continuing involvement in the Project and are concerned about the positions being asserted here contrary to their own views. Ex. 4¶21, Ex. 8, Ex. 10.

V. If an Injunction Issues, Intervening Plaintiffs Must Post a Bond.

If the Court issues an injunction, it should order Intervenor]s to post a bond sufficient to cover “the costs and damages sustained” by Lithium Nevada if it is “found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c). The Court has the discretion to determine whether to require a bond and the extent of that bond as a condition of issuance of a preliminary injunction, *Cal. ex rel. Van De Kamp v. TRPA*, 766 F.2d 1319, 1325 (9th Cir. 1985), and “each case is fact-specific.” *Save Our Sonoran, Inc. v. Flowers*, 408 F.3d 1113, 1126 (9th Cir. 2005).

Lithium Nevada would be significantly harmed by delaying the cultural resource mitigation Intervenor challenge. Delay of the cultural resource work could lead to substantial delays that would cause Lithium Nevada significant costs. Ex. 7 ¶ 33. Lithium Nevada projects that such a delay will cost the company over \$5 million in overhead costs and over \$900 million in revenue on an annual basis. *Id.* ¶ 35. It may also affect Lithium Nevada’s ability to obtain the financing necessary to fund future mine development. *Id.* ¶¶ 34, 36. Intervenor argues that The People has “a very limited capacity to post a bond,” but makes no such claim as to RS Colony, instead arguing that its efforts to “ensure that the BLM follows the NHPA regulations” are sufficient basis to excuse it from anything more than a nominal bond. However, this does not address the substantial costs Intervenor seeks to impose on Lithium Nevada. A bond to offset the financial and operational risk of a wrongful injunction is appropriate under the circumstances and should be significant given the potential damage to Lithium Nevada and risk to national policies and security.

CONCLUSION

For all of these reasons Intervenor’s Motion should be denied.

DATED this 12th day of August, 2021.

HOLLAND & HART LLP

/s/ Laura K. Granier

 Laura K. Granier, Esq (SBN 7357)
 Erica K. Nannini, Esq (SBN 13922)

lkgranier@hollandhart.com
eknannini@hollandhart.com

*Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenor
 Lithium Nevada Corp.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 12, 2021, I filed the foregoing using the United States District Court CM/ECF, which caused all counsel of record to be served electronically.

/s/ Laura K. Granier
Laura K. Granier, Esq (SBN 7357)

17183647_v2

HOLLAND & HART LLP
5441 KIETZKE LANE, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89511-2094

EXHIBIT INDEX

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	# OF PAGES
1.	President Biden's Executive Order 14017	9
2.	Catherine Clark Declaration	41
3.	Randal Burns Declaration	11
4.	Maria Anderson Declaration	37
5.	Pepi Bengoa Declaration	3
6.	Joe Lowry Declaration	20
7.	Alexi Zawadzki Declaration	40
8.	Alana Crutcher Declaration	6
9.	Thacker Pass Memorandum of Agreement	20
10.	Alice Crutcher Declaration	3

17221185_v1